



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/532,815	04/26/2005	Yuichi Kubo	740107-185	8898

25570 7590 11/09/2009
ROBERTS MLOTKOWSKI SAFRAN & COLE, P.C.
Intellectual Property Department
P.O. Box 10064
MCLEAN, VA 22102-8064

EXAMINER

MCCLELLAND, KIMBERLY KEIL

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1791

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

11/09/2009

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

lgallaugh@rmsclaw.com
dbeltran@rmsclaw.com
bdiaz@rmsclaw.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/532,815	Applicant(s) KUBO ET AL.	
	Examiner KIMBERLY K. MCCLELLAND	Art Unit 1791	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06/29/09.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 6 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant is reminded they need to explicitly point out where support for all the newly claimed features comes from as required by MPEP 714.02 and 2163.06. See 37 CFR 1.111.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The newly added claim language in independent claim 1 of maintaining a "maximally expanded state" is new matter. Applicant has not specified where support for this amendment may be found. The specification as originally filed does not disclose a maximally expanded state. The drawings do not disclose this feature. There is no indication anywhere in the current application that the state in which the spacings are maintained is also the maximum spacing state. There is no disclosure that an "increased" spacing equates to a "maximum" spacing. Consequently, applicant's amendment introduces new matter into

the current application. Clarification is required. Dependent claims 2-20 are rejected due to dependency on independent claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,344,402 to Sekiya.

6. With respect to claim 1, Sekiya discloses a method of dicing a workpiece, including a conveying step of conveying said plate-like article (W) together with said chuck stage (21) of said dicing device to a different area in said dicing device without being detached from a chuck stage after the dicing of said plate-like article; an expanding step of expanding said adhesive sheet so as to produce spacings between individual chips with said plate-like article being mounted to said frame (F) in a wafer spreader of an expansion device; and an expansion maintaining step of maintaining in a maximally expanded state of said adhesive sheet with the spacings between individual chips unchanged and with said plate-like article remaining mounted to said frame after said expanding step, and wherein at least said expansion maintaining step is performed in said different area, and conveying said plate-like article from the wafer spreader of

Art Unit: 1791

said expansion station together with said frame with the increased spacings between said chips being maintained (column 3, line 55-column 4, lines 43; See Figures 8-9).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,344,402 to Sekiya as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,766,638 to Moore ('638).

9. With respect to claim 2, Sekiya discloses a method of dicing a workpiece (column 3, line 55-column 4, line 43). However, Sekiya does not disclose the expanding step includes a step of heating and stretching said adhesive sheet.

10. As to claim 2, Moore ('638) discloses the expanding step includes a step of heating and stretching said adhesive sheet (column 3, lines 23-25 and lines 45-47). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the heating step of Moore ('638) with the stretching step of Sekiya. The motivation would have been to put a permanent stretch into the adhesive tape, preserving interval spacing (column 3, lines 45-47)

11. Claims 3-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,344,402 to Sekiya as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,186,775 to Cullen et al.

12. With respect to claim 3, Sekiya discloses a method of dicing a workpiece (column 3, line 55-column 4, line 43). However, Sekiya does not disclose the expansion maintaining step includes a step of welding or bonding a base of said protrusion of said adhesive sheet.

13. Cullen et al. discloses a container fabrication method, including expansion maintaining step includes a step of welding or bonding a base of said protrusion of said adhesive sheet (column 3, lines 15-22; See Figures 8-10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the welding step taught by Cullen et al. with the expansion maintaining step disclosed by Sekiya. The motivation would have been to secure the edges of the adhesive film improving stabilization of the expanded sheet through immobilization.

14. As to claim 4, Sekiya discloses a method of dicing a workpiece (column 3, line 55-column 4, line 43). However, Sekiya does not disclose the base of said protrusion formed in said adhesive sheet is ultrasonically welded.

15. Cullen et al. discloses a container fabrication method, including base of said protrusion formed in said adhesive sheet is ultrasonically welded (column 3, lines 15-22; See Figures 8-10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the welding step taught by Cullen et al. with the expansion maintaining step disclosed by Sekiya. The motivation would have been

Art Unit: 1791

to secure the edges of the adhesive film improving stabilization of the expanded sheet through immobilization.

16. Claims 5-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,344,402 to Sekiya as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,209,958 to Bailey.

17. With respect to claim 5, Sekiya discloses a method of dicing a workpiece including expanding step is performed with said plate-like article being placed on said chuck stage of said dicing device, and includes a step of temporarily maintaining the expanded state of said adhesive sheet on said chuck stage using a clamping member (column 3, line 55-column 4, line 43). However, Sekiya does not specifically disclose the expansion maintaining step includes a step of forming a loose part outside said clamping member of said adhesive sheet to nip and secure a base of said loose part of said adhesive sheet.

18. Bailey discloses an article strapping method, including forming a loose part (64/66) outside said clamping member (48/52/55) of said sheet to nip and secure a base of said loose part of said sheet (See Figures 6-9). The combination of the prior art elements of clamping to form excess film used along with bonding the excess film would have yielded the predictable result of reducing the bulk of the excess film material. The claimed subject matter merely combines familiar elements (clamping and bonding excess film) according to known methods and does no more than yield predictable results. If a technique has been used to improve one device (e.g. packaging device),

and a person of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that it would improve similar devices in the same way (film stretching), using the technique is obvious unless its actual application is beyond his or her skill.

19. As to claim 6, Sekiya discloses the expanding step is performed by said expansion device in a dicing area of said dicing device after the dicing of said plate-like article, and said plate-like article with the fully expanded state of said adhesive sheet being temporarily maintained is conveyed to a different area in said dicing device together with said chuck stage, and said expansion maintaining step is performed in said different area (column 3, line 55-column 4, line 43).

20. As to claim 7, Sekiya discloses expanding step and said expansion maintaining step are performed in said different area in said dicing device column 3, line 55-column 4, line 43).

21. As to claim 8, Sekiya discloses a method of dicing a workpiece (column 3, line 55-column 4, line 43). However, Sekiya does not disclose the expansion maintaining step includes a step of securing said base of said loose part of said adhesive sheet by welding or bonding.

22. Bailey discloses an article strapping method, including the expansion maintaining step includes a step of securing said base of said loose part (64/66) of said sheet by welding or bonding (See Figures 6-9). The combination of the prior art elements of clamping to form excess film used along with bonding the excess film would have yielded the predictable result of reducing the bulk of the excess film material. The claimed subject matter merely combines familiar elements (clamping and bonding

Art Unit: 1791

excess film) according to known methods and does no more than yield predictable results. If a technique has been used to improve one device (e.g. packaging device), and a person of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that it would improve similar devices in the same way (film stretching), using the technique is obvious unless its actual application is beyond his or her skill.

23. Claims 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,344,402 to Sekiya as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,176,966 to Tsujimoto et al.

24. With respect to claim 9, Sekiya discloses a method of dicing a workpiece (column 3, line 55-column 4, line 43). However, Sekiya does not disclose a heat-shrinkable sheet is used as said adhesive sheet, and said expanding step and said expansion maintaining step are simultaneously performed by heating said adhesive sheet in at least a pair of areas sandwiching said plate-like article in parallel with a dicing line of said plate-like article in the portion of said adhesive sheet between said plate-like article and said frame.

25. Tsujimoto et al. discloses a die bonding method, including a heat-shrinkable sheet is used as said adhesive sheet, and said expanding step and said expansion maintaining step are simultaneously performed by heating said adhesive sheet in at least a pair of areas (3; See Figure 1) sandwiching said plate-like article in parallel with a dicing line of said plate-like article in the portion of said adhesive sheet between said plate-like article and said frame (column 2, lines 26-33). It is known in the art that

stretching/tensioning a web may be performed by decreasing the amount of material over a given length, increasing the length of the web, or a combination of each to yield the predictable result of an expanded web. The substitution of one tensioning method (the heat-shrink film taught by Tsujimoto et al.) for another (the upward force expansion disclosed in Sekiya) would achieve the predictable result of forming spaces between individual chips.

26. As to claim 10, Sekiya discloses a method of dicing a workpiece (column 3, line 55-column 4, line 43). However, Sekiya does not disclose the adhesive sheet is heated in at least a pair of areas sandwiching said plate-like article in parallel with a dicing line in one direction of said plate-like article, and in at least a pair of areas sandwiching said plate-like article in parallel with a dicing line perpendicular to the dicing line in said one direction, and heating temperatures of said areas are individually controlled according to the state of increase in the spacings between said individual chips.

27. Tsujimoto et al. discloses a die bonding method, including the adhesive sheet is heated in at least a pair of areas (3; See Figure 1) sandwiching said plate-like article in parallel with a dicing line in one direction of said plate-like article, and in at least a pair of areas sandwiching said plate-like article in parallel with a dicing line perpendicular to the dicing line in said one direction, and heating temperatures of said areas are individually controlled according to the state of increase in the spacings between said individual chips (column 2, lines 26-33; column 6, lines 23-25). It is known in the art that stretching/tensioning a web may be performed by decreasing the amount of material over a given length, increasing the length of the web, or a combination of each to yield

the predictable result of an expanded web. The substitution of one tensioning method (the heat-shrink film taught by Tsujimoto et al.) for another (the upward force expansion disclosed in Sekiya) would achieve the predictable result of forming spaces between individual chips.

28. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,344,402 to Sekiya in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,176,966 to Tsujimoto et al. as applied to claims 9-10 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,688,540 to Ono.

29. With respect to claim 11, Sekiya discloses a method of dicing a workpiece (column 3, line 55-column 4, line 43). However, Sekiya does not disclose after the dicing of said plate-like article, said adhesive sheet is heated without said plate-like article being detached from said chuck stage of said dicing device.

30. Tsujimoto et al. discloses a die bonding method, including a heat-shrinkable sheet is used as said adhesive sheet, and said expanding step and said expansion maintaining step are simultaneously performed by heating said adhesive sheet in at least a pair of areas (3; See Figure 1) sandwiching said plate-like article in parallel with a dicing line of said plate-like article in the portion of said adhesive sheet between said plate-like article and said frame (column 2, lines 26-33). It is known in the art that stretching/tensioning a web may be performed by decreasing the amount of material over a given length, increasing the length of the web, or a combination of each to yield the predictable result of an expanded web. The substitution of one tensioning method

(the heat-shrink film taught by Tsujimoto et al.) for another (the upward force expansion disclosed in Sekiya) would achieve the predictable result of forming spaces between individual chips.

31. Ono discloses a dicing method, including after the dicing of said plate-like article, said adhesive sheet is transported without said plate-like article being detached from said chuck stage of said dicing device (See Figure 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the step of conveying the attached wafer taught by Ono with the conveying step of Sekiya. The motivation would have been to allow the wafer and chips to be transported with greater efficiency and minimal disturbance.

32. Claims 12-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,344,402 to Sekiya as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,790,051 to Moore ('051) and U.S. Patent No. 6,176,966 to Tsujimoto et al.

33. With respect to claim 12, Sekiya discloses a method of dicing a workpiece (column 3, line 55-column 4, line 43). However, Sekiya does not disclose a heat-shrinkable sheet is used as said adhesive sheet, and said expansion maintaining step includes a step of forming a loose part in a portion of said adhesive sheet between said plate-like article and said frame, and heating and shrinking said loose part to eliminate said loose part.

Art Unit: 1791

34. Moore ('051) discloses a wafer fracturing technique, including the expansion maintaining step includes a step of forming a loose part in a portion of said adhesive sheet between said plate-like article and said frame (201; See Figure 8). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to form a loose part as taught by Moore ('051) in the adhesive sheet of Moore ('638). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the vacuum maintaining step taught by Moore ('051) with the expansion maintaining step of Sekiya. The motivation would have been to tightly form the adhesive sheet onto the surrounding frame, even after the tensioning force is eliminated.

35. Tsujimoto et al. discloses a die bonding method, including a heat-shrinkable sheet is used as said adhesive sheet (3; See Figure 1) and heating and the excess film to eliminate the excess film (column 2, lines 26-33). It is known in the art that stretching/tensioning a web may be performed by decreasing the amount of material over a given length, increasing the length of the web, or a combination of both to yield the predictable result of an expanded web. The substitution of one tensioning method (the heat-shrink film taught by Tsujimoto et al.) for another (the upward force expansion disclosed in Sekiya) would achieve the predictable result of forming spaces between individual chips.

36. As to claim 13, Sekiya discloses a method of dicing a workpiece (column 3, line 55-column 4, line 43). However, Sekiya does not disclose the loose part is formed after the expanded state of said adhesive sheet in the portion on which said expanded plate-

Art Unit: 1791

like article is stuck is maintained by suction or mechanically, and said maintenance by suction or mechanical maintenance is released after said loose part is heated and shrunk.

37. Moore ('051) discloses a wafer fracturing technique, including the loose part is formed after the expanded state of said adhesive sheet in the portion on which said expanded plate-like article is stuck is maintained by suction or mechanically, and said maintenance by suction or mechanical maintenance is released (201; See Figure 8). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to form a loose part as taught by Moore ('051) in the adhesive sheet of Sekiya. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the vacuum maintaining step taught by Moore ('051) with the expansion maintaining step of Sekiya. The motivation would have been to tightly form the adhesive sheet onto the surrounding frame, even after the tensioning force is eliminated.

38. Tsujimoto et al. discloses a die bonding method, including a heat-shrinkable sheet is used as said adhesive sheet (3; See Figure 1) and heating and the excess film to eliminate the excess film (column 2, lines 26-33). It is known in the art that stretching/tensioning a web may be performed by decreasing the amount of material over a given length, increasing the length of the web, or a combination of both to yield the predictable result of an expanded web. The substitution of one tensioning method (the heat-shrink film taught by Tsujimoto et al.) for another (the upward force expansion

Art Unit: 1791

disclosed in Sekiya) would achieve the predictable result of forming spaces between individual chips.

39. As to claim 14, Sekiya discloses a method of dicing a workpiece (column 3, line 55-column 4, line 43). However, Sekiya does not disclose the relative separation between said plate-like article and said frame is terminated to form said loose part.

40. Moore ('051) discloses a wafer fracturing technique, including the loose part is formed when relative separation between said plate-like article and said frame is terminated (201; See Figure 8). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to form a loose part as taught by Moore ('051) in the adhesive sheet of Sekiya. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the vacuum maintaining step taught by Moore ('051) with the expansion maintaining step of Sekiya. The motivation would have been to tightly form the adhesive sheet onto the surrounding frame, even after the tensioning force is eliminated.

41. As to claim 15, Sekiya discloses said adhesive sheet is pressed between said plate-like article and said frame to expand said adhesive sheet (See Figure 8).

However, Sekiya does not disclose the press of said adhesive sheet between said plate-like article and said frame is released to form said loose part.

42. Moore ('051) discloses a wafer fracturing technique, including the press of said adhesive sheet between said plate-like article and said frame is released to form said loose part (201; See Figure 8). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to form a loose part as taught by Moore ('051) in

Art Unit: 1791

the adhesive sheet of Sekiya. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the vacuum maintaining step taught by Moore ('051) with the expansion maintaining step of Sekiya. The motivation would have been to tightly form the adhesive sheet onto the surrounding frame, even after the tensioning force is eliminated.

43. As to claim 16, Sekiya discloses a method of dicing a workpiece (column 3, line 55-column 4, line 43). However, Sekiya does not disclose portion of said adhesive sheet outside said plate-like article is heated in a ring shape to shrink said loose part.

44. Tsujimoto et al. discloses a die bonding method, including a portion of said adhesive sheet outside said plate-like article is heated in a ring shape to shrink said loose part (3; See Figure 1). It is known in the art that stretching/tensioning a web may be performed by decreasing the amount of material over a given length, increasing the length of the web, or a combination of both to yield the predictable result of an expanded web. The substitution of one tensioning method (the heat-shrink film taught by Tsujimoto et al.) for another (the upward force expansion disclosed in Sekiya) would achieve the predictable result of forming spaces between individual chips.

45. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,344,402 to Sekiya in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,790,051 to Moore ('051) and U.S. Patent No. 6,176,966 to Tsujimoto et al. as applied to claims 12-16 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,688,540 to Ono.

Art Unit: 1791

46. As to claim 17, Sekiya discloses the adhesive sheet is expanded (column 3, line 55-column 4, lines 43). However, Sekiya does not disclose after the dicing of said plate-like article, said adhesive sheet is expanded without said plate-like article being detached from said chuck stage of said dicing device.

47. Ono discloses a dicing method, including after the dicing of said plate-like article, said adhesive sheet is transported without said plate-like article being detached from said chuck stage of said dicing device (See Figure 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the step of conveying the attached wafer taught by Ono with the conveying step of Sekiya. The motivation would have been to allow the wafer and chips to be transported with greater efficiency and minimal disturbance.

48. Claims 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,344,402 to Sekiya as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,383,606 to Broyles and U.S. Patent No. 6,176,966 to Tsujimoto et al.

49. With respect to claim 18, Sekiya discloses a method of dicing a workpiece including expanding step includes a step of relatively vertically separating said plate-like article and said frame and expansion maintaining step includes a step of sticking a different ring-shaped frame to said expanded adhesive sheet (column 3, line 55-column 4, line 43). However, Sekiya does not specifically disclose applying a lateral force to said adhesive sheet, or cutting said adhesive sheet near an outer periphery of said different frame.

Art Unit: 1791

50. Broyles discloses a method of expanding wafers, including applying a lateral force to said adhesive sheet (See Figures 6-7). It is known in the art that stretching/tensioning a web may be performed by decreasing the amount of material over a given length, increasing the length of the web, or a combination of both to yield the predictable result of an expanded web. The substitution of one tensioning method (the lateral force expansion taught by Broyles) for another (the upward force expansion disclosed in Sekiya) would achieve the predictable result of forming spaces between individual chips.

51. Tsujimoto et al. discloses a die bonding method, including cutting said adhesive sheet near an outer periphery of said different frame outwardly of a position at which the adhesive sheet is held (3; See Figure 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the excess sheet material cutting step taught by Tsujimoto et al. with the method of Sekiya. The motivation would have been to reduce the bulk of the resulting article, allowing more efficient transport and storage.

52. As to claim 19, Sekiya discloses a method of dicing a workpiece (column 3, line 55-column 4, line 43). However, Sekiya does not disclose the lateral force applied to said adhesive sheet is applied by inflating an airbag.

53. Broyles discloses a method of expanding wafers, including the lateral force applied to said adhesive sheet is applied by inflating an airbag (See Figures 6-7). It is known in the art that stretching/tensioning a web may be performed by decreasing the amount of material over a given length, increasing the length of the web, or a

Art Unit: 1791

combination of both to yield the predictable result of an expanded web. The substitution of one tensioning method (the lateral force expansion taught by Broyles) for another (the upward force expansion disclosed in Sekiya) would achieve the predictable result of forming spaces between individual chips.

54. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,344,402 to Sekiya in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,383,606 to Broyles and U.S. Patent No. 6,176,966 to Tsujimoto et al. as applied to claims 18-19 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,766,638 to Moore ('638).

55. As to claim 20, Sekiya discloses a method of dicing a workpiece (column 3, line 55-column 4, line 43). However, Sekiya does not disclose the different ring is the same size as the frame.

56. Moore ('638) discloses it is known in the art to use ring of the same size as clamping members (5/11; See Figure 2). It is inherent the different ring (column 4, lines 2-10) would be of the same type and dimensions as the first ring (5/11), in order to tightly fit around the button (18). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the same sized rings taught by Moore ('638) with the method of Sekiya. The motivation would have been to prevent mechanical shock during transport (column 4, lines 2-10).

Response to Arguments

57. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Applicant's remaining pertinent arguments are addressed below:

58. With respect to applicant's assertion that Sekiya discloses removing the stretching ring 26 causes "adjacent pellets to come close together", examiner disagrees. Examiner was unable to locate the specified passage cited by applicant as stating removal of the ring 26 causes adjacent pellets to come closer together. Sekiya specifically discloses "The frame F is released from the frame holder 22, and then, the wafer-and-frame combination is released from the holding-and-carrying section 20. The wafer-and-frame combination has adjacent pellets separated apart from each other on its expanded adhesive tape T. Thus, there is no fear for physical interference between adjacent pellets, which physical interference would cause undesired cracks on the confronting edges of adjacent pellets while being carried to subsequent manufacturing station." Column 4, lines 32-36. Consequently, applicant's assertion that Sekiya specifically discloses bringing the pellets closer together is unsupported. Therefore, the amendment is not found to overcome the current 102 (b) and 103 (a) rejections.

Conclusion

59. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

60. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KIMBERLY K. MCCLELLAND whose telephone number is (571)272-2372. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 a.m.-5 p.m. Mon-Thr.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Philip C. Tucker can be reached on (571)272-1095. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1791

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Kimberly K McClelland/
Examiner, Art Unit 1791

KKM

/Philip C Tucker/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1791